DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 552 EA 004 104

AUTHOR	Harman, G. S.
TITLE	Education and the Political System.
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	32p.; Paper presented at Australasian Political Studies Association annual conference (12th, Canberra, Australia, August 1970)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Influence; Community Leaders; *Education; *Political Influences; Political Power; *Politics; *Power Structure
IDENTIFIERS	Australia

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the recent development within political science of an interest in education problems and in the political functions and political aspects of education processes and institutions in societies. The paper further provides an exploratory account of some of the connections between formal education and political life in Australia. (Author)

ED 059552

EDUCATION AND THE POLITICAL SYSTEM

by

G.S. Harman

Research School of Social Sciences

Australian National University

Australasian Political Studies Association

Twelfth Annual Conference

Canberra, August 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

2

Education and the Political System

This paper considers briefly the recent development within political science of an interest in education problems, and in the political functions and political aspects of education processes and institutions in societies. It also provides an exploratory account of some of the connections between formal education and political life in Australia.

Education and Political Science

Scholarly concern with the relationship between education and politics is by no means new. Indeed, for well over two thousand years philosophers, students of politics and educators have discussed and argued about how education relates to political life. Plato and Aristotle were sensitive to the role of education in relation to the state, and since then in political philosophy there has been a long tradition of concern about the role of education. Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Stuart Mill, John Locke and John Dewey, for example, were all interested in questions relating to the place of education in a democratic political order. Mill was particularly concerned about the effect of government control of schools on their political independence; he feared that 'a general state education' would operate as a 'mere

Education and the Political System

This paper considers briefly the recent development within political science of an interest in education problems, and in the political functions and political aspects of education processes and institutions in societies. It also provides an exploratory account of some of the connections between formal education and political life in Australia.

Education and Political Science

Scholarly concern with the relationship between education and politics is by no means new. Indeed, for well over two thousand years philosophers, students of politics and educators have discussed and argued about how education relates to political life. Plato and Aristotle were sensitive to the role of education in relation to the state, and since then in political philosophy there has been a long tradition of concern about the role of education. Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Stuart Mill, John Locke and John Dewey, for example, were all interested in questions relating to the place of education in a democratic political order. Mill was particularly concerned about the effect of government control of schools on their political independence; he feared that 'a general state education' would operate as a 'mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another' and would be likely to establish 'a despotism over the mind, leading a natural tendency to one over the body'[1]. Many students of politics have been interested in the influence of education on the growth of modern nationalism, and its instrumental use by totalitarian regimes. A sizeable body of literature has been built up on these subjects.[2] Educators in most democratic societies for many years have accepted the notion that schools should prepare young people for active citizenship; consequently, they have concerned themselves with developing suitable programmes of citizenship training and with promoting allegiance to the idea of democratic self-government. Furthermore, for generations statesmen and political leaders have been well aware of the impact that education can,and does,have on political life. When political systems have undergone radical transformations,as for example after the French and Russian revolutions, the new rulers have quickly endeavoured to reform and use the educational systems for their own purposes. And in

---

[1] Quoted by P.H. Partridge, Society, Schools and Progress in Australia, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1968, p. 60.

[2] For example, Edward H. Reisner, Nationalism and Education since 1789, Macmillan, New York, 1922; Bruce T. McCully, English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism, Columbia University Press, New York, 1950; and J.L. Talmon, The Rise of Totalitarian Democracy, Beacon Press, Boston, 1952.

many totalitarian and developing societies today political leaders are well aware of how education can be used to help achieve political goals.

Yet, curiously, despite this long tradition of scholarly and practical concern about the connections between education and politics, until very recently, with a few notable exceptions,[3] modern political science paid little interest in the overall character of the education-polity nexus, and showed little interest in empirical studies of the political functions of education. In 1957 David Easton fairly complained:

> Over two thousand years ago education occupied a prominent position in political thought; today, in political science as a whole, atte tion to the problems of education has all but disappeared.[4]

This neglect of education by political scientists until the late 1950s or 1960s is not easy to explain. Easton has attributed it to the increased specialization of scholarly disciplines and research which meant that the study of the role of education was relegated, by default, to educators, and also to the way that political science came to be conceptualized as a discipline. On the second point he has argued that, because of the over-riding concern of political science up to late 1950s either with power or with normative political theory, the notion of the political relevance of education was severely constricted.[5] Others have suggested that political scientists were not interested in education because of their heavy pre-occupation with the study of the formal institutions of government and national and international politics, because of the low intellectual and professional status of education, because of the lack of national debate about education policy, and because of the strong belief in many societies, but particularly in the United States, that education

---

[3]For example, John A. Vieg, The Government of Education in Metropolitan Chicago, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937; Bruce Raup, Education and Organized Interests in America, G.P. Putnam, New York, 1936; and Leicester Webb, The Control of Education in New Zealand, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington, 1937.

[4]David Easton, 'The Function of Formal Education in a Political System', The School Review, Vol. LXV, Autumn 1957, p. 304.

[5]Ibid., pp. 304 - 306.

should be kept out of politics[6]. The late V.O. Key, Jr., suggested that in the United States because of the highly decentralized character of education the schools were not 'so obviously seen as arms of governance'[7] and consequently did not attract the attention of political scientists. In Australia this neglect can be attributed to many of the factors already mentioned, but also particularly to the lack of public interest in, and concern about, education, and to the extremely narrow and limited research interests of political scientists in this country. Of course, it should be remembered that even in the 1950s political science in Australia was a very new discipline, and until very recently indeed political science departments were extremely small and their resources did not permit the development of a wide range of research interests.[8]

Educators, too, until the last decade or so showed little interest in exploring the connections between education and politics. They were little concerned with any of the links between education and the wider society. As C. Arnold Anderson has noted, even when educators turned to comparative studies, they generally confined their attention exclusively to educational data, 'treating education as if it were an autonomous social system'[9]. Moreover, particularly in the United States, educators believed, or in order to secure the autonomy of schools and school systems deliberately chose to believe, that education

---

[6] On this belief in the United States, see Stephen K. Bailey et al., Schoolmen in Politics: A Study of State Aid to Education in the Northeast, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1962, pp. viii - ix; Roscoe C. Martin, Government and the Suburban School, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1962, pp. 59 - 60; and Alan Rosenthal (ed.), Governing Education: A Reader on Politics, Power and Public School Policy, Doubleday and Company, New York, 1969, p. ix.

[7] V.O. Key, Jr., Public Opinion and American Democracy, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1961, p. 316.

[8] Most political science departments were established after 1949, and as late as 1960 there were still only six full professors of political science in Australian universities.
On the development of political science in Australia, see G. Sawer, 'Political Science in Australia' in Contemporary Political Science, UNESCO, Paris, 1950; R.N. Spann, 'Political Science in Australia', The Australian Journal of Politics and History, Vol. I, No. 2 (November 1955); the special issue of The Australian Journal of Political Science, Vol. IV, No. 2 (August 1958), devoted to the teaching of political science; and G.S. Harman, 'Political Science' in David G. Dufty (ed.), Teaching about Society, Rigby, Adelaide, 1970.

[9] C. Arnold Anderson, 'Methodology of Comparative Education', International Review of Education, Vol. VII, 1961.

should be 'kept out of politics'[10]. Admittedly, a few students of educational administration considered aspects of the political context of education, but generally they went no further than describing the formal structure of institutions.

During the last decade however, the situation changed, and today in many countries there is a growing interest by political scientists and educators (particularly students of educational administration) in many facets of the polity-education nexus, and in pursuing research projects on political aspects and political functions of education. This development began in the United States, and today the politics of education is much more highly developed as a field for research and teaching in that country than elsewhere.

In the late 1950s in the United States a handful of individual political scientists and educators became interested in a number of different facets of the politics of education. In 1957 Easton complained of the neglect of education by political scientists, and pointed to the important role of the school in the process of political socialization[11]. Two years later Thomas H. Eliot, in a paper published in the American Political Science Review, called for the serious study of public school politics. He maintained that, because school districts are governmental units, school board members and superintendents are engaged in politics, whether they like it or not. 'Surely it is high time', he wrote,

> to stop being frightened by a word. Politics includes the making of governmental decisions, and the effort or struggle to gain or keep power to make those decisions. Public schools are part of government. They are political entities. They are a fit subject for study by political scientists[12].

Interest quickly developed, and soon a surprising number of political scientists and educators were working on projects on different aspects of the politics of education. By 1965 numerous journal articles, together with a number of important books, such as Burkhead's[13] Public School Finance: Economics and Politics, Kimbrough's[14] Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Greenstein's,[15] Children

---

[10]Educators in the United States admittedly had good reason to keep schools out of politics. Over the years, as Thomas H. Eliot has observed, whole school systems had 'been blighted by the intrusion of certain aspects of politics, especially the use of patronage in appointments and contracts in apparent disregard to give children the

should be kept out of politics [illegible]

educational administration considered aspects of the political context of education, but generally they went no further than describing the formal structure of institutions.

During the last decade however, the situation changed, and today in many countries there is a growing interest by political scientists and educators (particularly students of educational administration) in many facets of the polity-education nexus, and in pursuing research projects on political aspects and political functions of education. This development began in the United States, and today the politics of education is much more highly developed as a field for research and teaching in that country than elsewhere.

In the late 1950s in the United States a handful of individual political scientists and educators became interested in a number of different facets of the politics of education. In 1957 Easton complained of the neglect of education by political scientists, and pointed to the important role of the school in the process of political socialization[11]. Two years later Thomas H. Eliot, in a paper published in the American Political Science Review, called for the serious study of public school politics. He maintained that, because school districts are governmental units, school board members and superintendents are engaged in politics, whether they like it or not. 'Surely it is high time', he wrote,

> to stop being frightened by a word. Politics includes the making of governmental decisions, and the effort or struggle to gain or keep power to make those decisions. Public schools are part of government. They are political entities. They are a fit subject for study by political scientists[12].

Interest quickly developed, and soon a surprising number of political scientists and educators were working on projects on different aspects of the politics of education. By 1965 numerous journal articles, together with a number of important books, such as Burkhead's[13] Public School Finance: Economics and Politics, Kimbrough's[14] Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Greenstein's,[15] Children

---

[10] Educators in the United States admittedly had good reason to keep schools out of politics. Over the years, as Thomas H. Eliot has observed, whole school systems had 'been blighted by the intrusion of certain aspects of politics, especially the use of patronage in appointments and contracts in apparent disregard to give children the best possible education'.

[11] Easton, pp. 304 - 316.

[12] Thomas H. Eliot, 'Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics', American Political Science Review, Vol. LII, No. 4, December 1959.

[13] Jesse Burkhead, Public School Finance: Economics and Politics, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1964.

[14] Ralph B. Kimbrough, Political Power and Educational Decision-Making, Rand, McNally and Company, Chicago, 1964.

[15] F.I. Greenstein, Children and Politics, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1965.

and Politics, and the detailed study by Masters, Salisbury and Eliot[16] of politics and education in three states, had appeared. In the last five years the volume of literature has vastly increased. Recent publications include Bailey and Mosher's[17] detailed study of the United States Office of Education and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Rosenthal's[18] study of the pressure group activities of various teacher's associations, Meranto's[19] book, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965, Hess and Torney's[20] book on political socialization, Zeigler's[21] study of the political orientation of teachers, a large number of books and papers on urban school politics[22], and some fascinating studies of politics and education in developing societies[23]. Today in the United States research on the role of education in political socialization, the federal government and education, education pressure groups, school board politics, the politics of higher education and other aspects of the politics of education is being pursued in many university departments and in a number of special research centres[24]. Graduate courses are becoming

---

[16] Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, State Politics and the Public Schools: An Exploratory Analysis, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1964.

[17] Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1968.

[18] Alan Rosenthal, Pedagogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1969.

[19] Philip A. Meranto, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Inovation, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1967.

[20] R.D. Hess and J.V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Aldine, Chicago, 1967.

[21] Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1967.

[22] For example, Robert L. Crain, The Politics of School Desegregation: Comparative Case Studies of Community Structure and Policy-Making, Doubleday, New York, 1969; Marilyn Gittell, Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City, Praeger, New York, 1967; M. Gittell and T.E. Hollander, Six Urban School Districts: A Comparative Study of Institutional Response, Praeger, New York, 1968; D. Rogers, 110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in New York City Schools, Random House, New York, 1966; and M. Gittell and A.G. Hevesi (Eds.) The Politics of Urban Education: A Reader, Praeger, New York, 1969.

[23] For example, Andreas M. Kazamias, Education and the Quest for Modernity in Turkey, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1966; David B. Abernethy, The Political Dilemma of Popular Education: A African Case,

and Politics, and the detailed study by Masters, Salisbury and Eliot[16] of politics and education in three states, had appeared. In the last five years the volume of literature has vastly increased. Recent publications include Bailey and Mosher's[17] detailed study of the United States Office of Education and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Rosenthal's[18] study of the pressure group activities of various teacher's associations, Meranto's[19] book, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965, Hess and Torney's[20] book on political socialization, Zeigler's[21] study of the political orientation of teachers, a large number of books and papers on urban school politics[22], and some fascinating studies of politics and education in developing societies[23]. Today in the United States research on the role of education in political socialization, the federal government and education, education pressure groups, school board politics, the politics of higher education and other aspects of the politics of education is being pursued in many university departments and in a number of special research centres[24]. Graduate courses are becoming

---

[16] Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, State Politics and the Public Schools: An Exploratory Analysis, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1964.

[17] Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1968.

[18] Alan Rosenthal, Pedagogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1969.

[19] Philip A. Meranto, The Politics of Federal Aid to Education in 1965: A Study in Political Inovation, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1967.

[20] R.D. Hess and J.V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Aldine, Chicago, 1967.

[21] Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1967.

[22] For example, Robert L. Crain, The Politics of School Desegregation: Comparative Case Studies of Community Structure and Policy-Making, Doubleday, New York, 1969; Marilyn Gittell, Participants and Participation: A Study of School Policy in New York City, Praeger, New York, 1967; M. Gittell and T.E. Hollander, Six Urban School Districts: A Comparative Study of Institutional Response, Praeger, New York, 1968; D. Rogers, 110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in New York City Schools, Random House, New York, 1966; and M. Gittell and A.G. Hevesi (Eds.) The Politics of Urban Education: A Reader, Praeger, New York, 1969.

[23] For example, Andreas M. Kazamias, Education and the Quest for Modernity in Turkey, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1966; David B. Abernethy, The Political Dilemma of Popular Education: A African Case, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1969; and James Suchlicki, University Students and Revolution in Cuba, 1920-1968, University of Miami Press, Coral Gables, 1969. There are also two important earlier publications: James S. Coleman (ed.) Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1965; and Don C. Piper and Taylor Cole (eds.) Post-primary Education and Political and Economic Development, Duke University Press, Durham, 1964.

[24] Such centres include the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon; the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley; and the Center for Urban Education in New York.

increasingly common, and since 1969 the American Educational Research Association has had a separate 'interest group' in the politics of education[25].

Outside the United States there is evidence of growing interest in the politics of education in a number of countries, including Canada, Britain, New Zealand and Australia. In Australia, for example, until five or six years ago there was little noticeable interest. However, this situation has changed. Courses or course units on the politics of education now have been established in four or five universities, a number of graduate students in political science and education are writing theses on topics within the area, and a small body of literature has been built up[26].

The development of the politics of education as a field for research and teaching is an interesting phenomenon in itself. In the first place, it can be attributed to fundamental changes that have taken, and that are still taking, place within political science

---

[25]Michael W. Kirst and Edith K. Mosher, 'Politics of Education', Review of Educational Research, Vol. 39, No. 5 (1969). This paper includes an extensive bibliography. See also a useful review of the American literature in Frederick M. Wirt, 'Theory and Research Needs in the Study of American Educational Politics', The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (May 1970).

[26]The most important publication is P.H. Partridge's excellent study, Society, Schools and Progress in Australia. Other published material includes G.S. Harman, 'The Politics of Education in Australia', The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (May 1970); W.G. Walker, 'The Governance of Education in Australia: Centralization and Politics', The Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (May 1970); G.L. Johnston, 'Politics and Policy in Australian Education', The Forum of Education, Vol. XXVII, No. 1 (March 1968) and 'Central Governments and Secondary Education: United States and Australia', The Australian Journal of Education, Vol. 12, No. 3, (October 1968); B. Bessant, 'A Moment of Unity: The Establishment of the Victorian Teachers' Tribunal' in R.J.W. Selleck (ed.), Melbourne Studies in Education 1967, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1968; R.W. Connell, 'The Origins of Political Attitudes', Politics, Vol. 2, No. 2 (November 1967); Henry S. Albinski, The Australian Labor Party and the Aid to Parochial Schools Controversy, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, 1966; S. Encel, 'Education and Politics', Outlook, Vol. 9, No. 1 (February 1965); P.N. Gill, 'The Federal Science Grants Scheme: A Episode in Church-State Relations in Australia 1963-1964' and R.N. Spann, 'Administrative Theory and Educational Structure', both in E.L. French (ed.) Melbourne Studies in Education 1964, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1965.

and the study of education. Despite the continued trend towards specialization in research, in the last decade there has also been a growing awareness within the social sciences and education about the inter-relatedness of all social institutions and processes. There has also been an increasing tendency for disciplines to borrow insights and theories from other disciplines and fields. For example, the influence of sociology as well as psychology has sensitized both political scientists and educators to the relevance of the socialization process, the stratification system, the formation of elites, and the nature of formal organisations[27]. Or again, the work of Easton, Almond and Coleman, and others, largely inspired by sociological theory, has resulted in political scientists today being interested in a much wider range of social phenomena and processes. Harmon Zeigler [28] has argued that Easton's efforts in systems theory, in particular, have been important in directing the attention of political scientists to 'non-political institutions', such as schools, that have political consequences. Then too, within political science, the growth of interest in the politics of developing societies has tended to promote an increased awareness of the importance of education within political systems generally. Furthermore, the development of interest in policy research has directed attention to education and other important policy-areas, while a number of scholars in political science have been attracted to research in education because of a strong desire to be involved in projects having direct and practical application to the betterment of society. Within the study of education, an important factor has been the growth of the field of educational administration. Educators in this field have become increasingly concerned with understanding the political context in which schools operate; they have also come to appreciate increasingly that how schools systems are structured and governed has an important bearing on what goes on in classrooms, and how effectively schools are able to adapt themselves to social change. In Australia,as in the United States, the main impetus for the development of the politics of education within the field of education has come from scholars in educational administration.

---

[27] On this point, see James S. Coleman (ed.) Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1965, p. 10.

[28] Harmon Zeigler, 'Education and the Status Quo', Comparative Education, Vol. 6, No. 2 (March 1970).

Second, the development of interest in the politics of education in many countries appears to be directly related to the growing public concern and turmoil about education and related social problems. Student demonstrations and sit-ins, persistent complaints from concerned parents about education facilities, and the growing militancy of the teaching profession have all contributed to make education a major-issue area in politics. In the United States, the issue of school segregation has provided the stimulus for a number of studies of school board politics. Gittell has explained that angry debates and incidents in different communities over school segregation attracted the attention of a large number of political scientists who, once they began to explore educational policy on school integration, could not avoid the larger issue of how school systems are organised and how decisions are made[29].' And a sizeable number of political scientists interested in urban problems have been attracted to research on education policy and policy-making, since they recognise that education lies at the heart of the problems engulfing the urban poor and that it provides one important vehicle to overcoming problems.

Third, in the United States the development of the politics of education as a field for research owes much to the financial support given by private foundations and the federal government, and also to the interest and leadership of leading scholars such as David Easton. In a number of other countries including Australia, the contribution of a few key scholars has been of crucial importance too.

Education and the Political System

Education and politics are two fundamental activities in societies. The one has to do with the process of the transmission of knowledge and culture, and the development of skills and training for employment, while the other is concerned with the exercise of power, influence, and authority/and with the making of authoritative decisions about the allocation of values and resources. Almost inevitably, these two sets of activities will be inter-related. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of any type of society - modern, democratic, totalitarian, developing or primitive - in which education and politics were totally

Second, the development of interest in the politics of education in many countries appears to be directly related to the growing public concern and turmoil about education and related social problems. Student demonstrations and sit-ins, persistent complaints from concerned parents about education facilities, and the growing militancy of the teaching profession have all contributed to make education a major-issue area in politics. In the United States, the issue of school segregation has provided the stimulus for a number of studies of school board politics. Gittell has explained that angry debates and incidents in different communities over school segregation attracted the attention of a large number of political scientists who, once they began to explore educational policy on school integration, could not avoid the larger issue of how school systems are organised and how decisions are made[29].' And a sizeable number of political scientists interested in urban problems have been attracted to research on education policy and policy-making, since they recognise that education lies at the heart of the problems engulfing the urban poor and that it provides one important vehicle to overcoming problems.

Third, in the United States the development of the politics of education as a field for research owes much to the financial support given by private foundations and the federal government, and also to the interest and leadership of leading scholars such as David Easton. In a number of other countries including Australia, the contribution of a few key scholars has been of crucial importance too.

Education and the Political System

Education and politics are two fundamental activities in societies. The one has to do with the process of the transmission of knowledge and culture, and the development of skills and training for employment, while the other is concerned with the exercise of power, influence, and authority and with the making of authoritative decisions about the allocation of values and resources. Almost inevitably, these two sets of activities will be inter-related. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of any type of society - modern, democratic, totalitarian, developing or primitive - in which education and politics were totally unrelated and did not interact at all.

The actual form and extent of the connections between education and politics, however, varies between societies. In some societies the links are striking and obvious; in others

---

[29] Gittell, Participants and Participation, p.3.

they are less so. In some countries education is in the mainstream of political life, and constitutes a major issue-area in politics; in others, questions of education policy attract little or no public interest. Abernethy and Coombe have argued that 'the political signficance of education in contemporary societies increases with the degree of change a society is undergoing'[30], and they have explained the crucial importance of education in many developing societies in terms of the high rate of social and economic change. But the degree of inter-action between education and political processes and institutions, and how obvious this interaction is, appears to also depend on a number of other variables, including the extent to which the central institutions of government are involved in providing public education facilities and in exercising effective control over educational institutions; the level and relative importance of public expenditure on education; the institutional structures in educational institutions and systems; community attitudes about and demands for education; and the precise goals of educational institutions as seen by administrators and teachers, and the actual content and emphasis in courses of instruction. Certainly, all these factors, as well as the high rate of social and economic change, would have to be employed in trying to explain the obvious importance of the education-politics interaction in Australia today.

In our attempt to explore some of the connections between education and politics in Australia, we will limit the concept of education used to refer to formal education only - that is, to the processes of teaching and learning in schools, colleges and universities, and to educational institutions and the structures that have been developed to control and administer them. This, of course, is a narrow view of education. Furthermore, learning that takes place outside the school contexts is often of political importance; for example, children acquire many of their political ideas from the family and the peer-group. Nevertheless, to make our task manageable, this limitation must be made.

On the other hand, the term politics will be used in a much broader sense than merely to do with the business of legal government. It will refer to the exercise of power, authority and rule, and to all those processes by which social values and

stream of political life, and constitutes a major issue-area in politics; in others, questions of education policy attract little or no public interest. Abernethy and Coombe have argued that 'the political signficance of education in contemporary societies increases with the degree of change a society is undergoing'[30], and they have explained the crucial importance of education in many developing societies in terms of the high rate of social and economic change. But the degree of inter-action between education and political processes and institutions, and how obvious this interaction is, appears to also depend on a number of other variables, including the extent to which the central institutions of government are involved in providing public education facilities and in exercising effective control over educational institutions; the level and relative importance of public expenditure on education; the institutional structures in educational institutions and systems; community attitudes about and demands for education; and the precise goals of educational institutions as seen by administrators and teachers, and the actual content and emphasis in courses of instruction. Certainly, all these factors, as well as the high rate of social and economic change, would have to be employed in trying to explain the obvious importance of the education-politics interaction in Australia today.

In our attempt to explore some of the connections between education and politics in Australia, we will limit the concept of education used to refer to formal education only - that is, to the processes of teaching and learning in schools, colleges and universities, and to educational institutions and the structures that have been developed to control and administer them. This, of course, is a narrow view of education. Furthermore, learning that takes place outside the school contexts is often of political importance; for example, children acquire many of their political ideas from the family and the peer-group. Nevertheless, to make our task manageable, this limitation must be made.

On the other hand, the term politics will be used in a much broader sense than merely to do with the business of legal government. It will refer to the exercise of power, authority and rule, and to all those processes by which social values and resources are authoritatively allocated.[31]

---

[30] David Abernethy and Trevor Coombe, 'Education and Politics in Developing Countries', Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 35, No. 3 (1965).

[31] Today political scientists generally hold a much broader conception of politics than was held in the past. Robert Dahl, for example, considers that politics arises whenever 'there are people living together in associations, whenever they are subject to some kind of Power, rulership, or authority'.

16

The connections and interaction between education and politics in a society can be explored in different ways. In our analysis, we will view political life and action as constituting a system of behaviour, the political system. The concept of a 'political system', as developed by David Easton and others, is now widely used within political science, and needs no detailed explanation[32]. The idea of political activities constituting a political system is a departure from the traditional ways of thinking about politics, based on the use of such concepts as 'the state', 'the government' and 'the nation'. Briefly, the concept of political system is based on the notion that political activities in a society are inter-related, and that consequently any disturbance in one activity or part of the system will affect others. It is also based on the notion that political actions can be thought of as making up an identifiable whole, having its own definite boundary though this boundary may shift from time to time. Unlike the traditional concepts such as government or state, the concept of political system includes both formal and informal political institutions and processes. At the core of the political system, according to the Easton model, are the activities of authoritative decision-making or, to use Easton's phrase, the 'authoritative allocation of values'. The inputs which keep the system going are the demands made on decision-makers by individual citizens and groups, and also the supports that enable the system to maintain itself and carry out its functions. Demands enter the political system from other systems or are generated in the political system. Outputs take the form of decisions and policies, many of which require implementation over time. Outputs have a direct effect in turn on inputs by means of feed-back mechanisms, and also a less direct effect on inputs through their influence on the environment.

ne Education Sub-System

In our analysis, we will first consider the education system as constituting a separate sub-system within the Australian political system.

---

[32] On the concept of political system and its use, see David

politics in a society can be explored in different ways. In our analysis, we will view political life and action as constituting a system of behaviour, the political system. The concept of a 'political system', as developed by David Easton and others, is now widely used within political science, and needs no detailed explanation[32]. The idea of political activities constituting a political system is a departure from the traditional ways of thinking about politics, based on the use of such concepts as 'the state', 'the government' and 'the nation'. Briefly, the concept of political system is based on the notion that political activities in a society are inter-related, and that consequently any disturbance in one activity or part of the system will affect others. It is also based on the notion that political actions can be thought of as making up an identifiable whole, having its own definite boundary though this boundary may shift from time to time. Unlike the traditional concepts such as government or state, the concept of political system includes both formal and informal political institutions and processes. At the core of the political system, according to the Easton model, are the activities of authoritative decision-making or, to use Easton's phrase, the 'authoritative allocation of values'. The inputs which keep the system going are the demands made on decision-makers by individual citizens and groups, and also the supports that enable the system to maintain itself and carry out its functions. Demands enter the political system from other systems or are generated in the political system. Outputs take the form of decisions and policies, many of which require implementation over time. Outputs have a direct effect in turn on inputs by means of feed-back mechanisms, and also a less direct effect on inputs through their influence on the environment.

ne Education Sub-System

In our analysis, we will first consider the education system as constituting a separate sub-system within the Australian political system.

---

[32] On the concept of political system and its use, see David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1965; Oran D. Young, Systems of Political Science, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1968; Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1966; and Roy E. Jones, The Functional Analysis of Politics, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1967. See also a very interesting attempt by Colin A. Hughes to apply the structural - functional approach to the Australian politics in A.F. Davies and S. Encel (eds) Australian Society: A Sociological Introduction Cheshire, Melbourne, Second edition, 1970.

The Australian political system can be conceived as including a number of different sub-systems, each concerned with a major policy-area, such as agriculture, external affairs and defence, education, or health and social services. These sub-systems in recent years have become decidedly more distinct because of the increased degree of dispersion of decision-making, necessitated largely by the increasing complexity of government and increased volume of government business.

The central elements in the education sub-system are the Commonwealth and state ministers of education, the education departments, and the boards and agencies concerned with the control or funding of educational activities. However, the sub-system must also include those pressure groups and individuals concerned with questions of education policy; consumers of education (i.e. students, employers, and, possibly, parents); and educational institutions, including schools and school personnel. There may be some surprise in including educational institutions, especially schools, within the sub-system, since their main orientations are not towards politics. But they are the subject of political concern, and their activities have clear political consequences. Furthermore, government schools must be included because of their direct control by education departments. On occasions, the sub-system must also include the political parties, Commonwealth and state parliaments and cabinets, and the Prime Minister and Premiers.

Today the education sub-system is of considerable over-all importance in the political system. In the first place, this is because education is now a major concern and responsibility for both Commonwealth and state governments. In each state, expenditure on education absorbs a significant proportion of total annual budgets (in 1968 the states spent on average 23 per cent of total consolidated revenue funds on education[33]) and generally constitutes the largest single item of government spending. The education portfolio in the states is usually held by a senior cabinet minister. The state governments provide school facilities for almost 80 per cent of Australian children; they also provide , from their own resources or in conjunction with the Commonwealth, facilities for technical, teacher and higher education. The

---

[33] R.T. Fitzgerald and Patsy Segall, 'Investment in Australian Education', Chronicle of Australian Education, Vol. 2, No. 1, (August 1969).

Commonwealth's involvement in education is fairly recent, but it is now (1970) spending at the rate of approximately $175 m. per year and providing approximately 20 per cent of public expenditure on education. Second, the education sub-system is important because education is directly controlled by governments. Primary, secondary, technical and a large proportion of teacher education come under the tight control of state education departments. Many of the new colleges of advanced education also come under the direct control of government departments. Being statutory authorities, the Universities and some colleges of advanced education technically enjoy a large measure of autonomy, but they have come increasingly under the effective control of the Australian Universities Commission and the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education, and, in a number of states, the new authorities responsible for co-ordinating higher education. Third, education now constitutes a very lively issue-area in politics. Over the last decade questions of education policy have become increasingly prominent in public debate. Today, as one prominent Australian educator recently remarked,

> education is currently a subject of more profound unrest than at any time since the ferment which preceded the Education Acts of a century ago which shaped the nation's pattern of schooling[34].

Everyday we hear complaints from parents and others about teacher shortages and inadequacies in education facilities. The issue of state aid for independent schools has produced a great deal of argument and debate, student protests have become increasingly common and noisy, and the teachers bodies have become decidedly more militant. In addition, education is now one of the more sensitive policy-areas in relations between the Commonwealth and the states.

Sub-systems perform all the basic functions of political systems. Because of space limitations and lack of information, here only a sketchy outline can be given of how the education sub-system functions.

Expectations, as Hughes[35] observes, set the background from which demands emerge. For many years in Australia it has

---

[34] Phillip Hughes, 'Innovation and Balance in the Curriculum', paper read at the conference of the Canadian Education Association, Banff, 1970.

[35] Colin A. Hughes, 'The Polity' in Davies and Encel, p. 233.

been accepted that the provision of schooling and higher education is a proper responsibility for governments. This belief came easily to a community which, to use Hancock's words, came 'to look upon the State as a vast public utility, whose duty it is to provide the greatest happiness for the greatest number'[36]. But in recent years community expectations about education have increased appreciably; parents and students have come to expect more and better education, and, as a result of the Commonwealth and state policies for financial assistance to independent schools over the last decade, the Catholic Church and independent schools have come to expect that the level of government support to the private sector will continue to steadily increase. These basic and rising expectations explain the current high level of public interest in questions of education policy, and the large volume of demands being made on official decision-makers.

Individuals sometimes articulate their own demands on education by writing to the press, the department of education, or even the Minister for Education or the Premier. Sometimes individuals seek interviews with public officials. On occasions individual citizens express their preferences on questions of education policy by voting for a candidate pledged, for example, to support or oppose state aid. Sometimes, too, individuals are able to persuade political parties to take up a cause. But generally the most important way for individuals to communicate demands is through organised groups. Most people are well aware of the pressure group activities of the teachers' associations, and of student and parent groups. But these are by no means the only pressure groups interested in questions of education policies and active in articulating demands; other pressure groups include the churches and attitude groups; groups representing community and regional interests; business and primary industry associations; trade unions, and professional associations such as the Australian Medical Association; the independent schools; the Australian College of Education, the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, the Federation of University Staff Associations, subject teachers' associations and other bodies representing professional educators in their different roles; and even official

---

36 W.K. Hancock, Australia, The Jacaranda Press, Brisbane, reprinted 1964, p.55.

institutions such as universities. There are obviously important differences between these groups - in the resources they command, in their goals, in the specific demands they make, in the targets they try to influence, and in the methods and strategies they employ. Some, like the teachers' associations, have the advantages of wealth, numbers, a highly structured formal organisation, and recognition by education departments and representation on departmental committees; other groups lack such resources, and sometimes do not even have a clear idea of the structure of the official decision-making processes in the area they seek to exert influence. Some pressure groups are primarily concerned with securing more funds for education, or a different allocation of resources within the education sector; others are more interested in influencing detailed education policies or practices, or sometimes with merely securing information. Some groups channel their demands mainly to one centre of official power, others to different centres, and others still are concerned with influencing decision-making at many different levels and areas of government. Some groups rely primarily on direct communication to government authorities; the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, for example, because of its membership composition, its goals and the recognition accorded it by the Commonwealth Government, generally relies on direct communication. Other groups, however, rely more on public compaigns, and some appear to work primarily through protest marches, sit-ins and confrontations with authorities. Recently a number of pressure groups interested in education have used election campaigns to advance their interests, some even running their own candidates.[37]

Supports constitute the other main input. We can distinguish between supports for the political system in general, its structures and individuals who occupy authoritative roles, and supports directed specifically to parts of the education sub-system. Overall, there is a high level of supports for the political system: the legitimacy of the regime is seldom questioned; there is a reverence of established constitutional order; material support in the form of taxes, levies and military service is generally forthcoming though sometimes under protest; despite a myth about being a law-breaking society, the rule of law operates strongly and there is

institutions such as universities. There are obviously important differences between these groups - in the resources they command, in their goals, in the specific demands they make, in the targets they try to influence, and in the methods and strategies they employ. Some, like the teachers' associations, have the advantages of wealth, numbers, a highly structured formal organisation, and recognition by education departments and representation on departmental committees; other groups lack such resources, and sometimes do not even have a clear idea of the structure of the official decision-making processes in the area they seek to exert influence. Some pressure groups are primarily concerned with securing more funds for education, or a different allocation of resources within the education sector; others are more interested in influencing detailed education policies or practices, or sometimes with merely securing information. Some groups channel their demands mainly to one centre of official power, others to different centres, and others still are concerned with influencing decision-making at many different levels and areas of government. Some groups rely primarily on direct communication to government authorities; the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, for example, because of its membership composition, its goals and the recognition accorded it by the Commonwealth Government, generally relies on direct communication. Other groups, however, rely more on public compaigns, and some appear to work primarily through protest marches, sit-ins and confrontations with authorities. Recently a number of pressure groups interested in education have used election campaigns to advance their interest, some even running their own candidates.[37]

Supports constitute the other main input. We can distinguish between supports for the political system in general, its structures and individuals who occupy authoritative roles, and supports directed specifically to parts of the education sub-system. Overall, there is a high level of supports for the political system: the legitimacy of the regime is seldom questioned; there is a reverence of established constitutional order; material support in the form of taxes, levies and military service is generally forthcoming though sometimes under protest; despite a myth about being a law-breaking society, the rule of law operates strongly; and there is still a moderately strong respect for public authority, and for symbols and ceremonials.

---

[37] In a number of states the Council for the Defence of Government Schools (D.O.G.S.) has run candidates in general elections and by-elections. The N.S.W. Federation of Parents and Citizens Associations contemplated running candidates in the next N.S.W. general election, but decided against it when the Governor threatened to withdraw as a Patron of the Federation.

Similar supports are directed to the education sub-system. However, a sizeable proportion of the population for many years has preferred to send their children to private or church schools, rather than to support state schools. Furthermore, very recently, the authority of official education decision-making bodies has been somewhat eroded; citizens and teachers now frequently question the policies adopted by governments and education departments, and in the universities, not only the decisions of councils, committees and administrators, but the composition and authority of decision-making bodies themselves have been under fire.

The key elements in the process of conversion of inputs into outputs are the official decision-making bodies. Constitutionally, the control of education at state and federal levels lies with the parliament, and frequently major changes in education policy need the enactment of legislation. But in practice, effective control lies more with the Ministers of Education, and with the senior officials in education departments, and in official agencies such as the Australian Universities Commission. Some decisions, such as on questions of state aid, are made by Ministers and their cabinet colleagues without reference to public servants. But on most specialized policies, the real power lies with departments and agencies. The state education departments (and in N.S.W. the Department of Technical Education) are large, complex structures, with a high degree of role specialization. They exercise a tight control over the administration of all public primary, secondary and technical education. Their high degree of administrative centralization is well-known, and has been criticized frequently by visiting and Australian educators[38]. From their head offices in the state capitals, these departments control budgeting, staff recruitment and promotion, planning and research, curricula, and the supply and equipment and erection of new buildings. Critics assert that this high degree of centralization has led to mediocrity in standards, to over-conformity and the stifling of experimentation, and the failure to treat teachers as professional people. The Commonwealth Department of Education and Science is probably less highly centralized; certainly considerable power is exercised by advisory committees and boards that have been appointed with responsibilities for particular policy-areas. And even in the states,

Similar supports are directed to the education sub-system. However, a sizeable proportion of the population for many years has preferred to send their children to private or church schools, rather than to support state schools. Furthermore, very recently, the authority of official education decision-making bodies has been somewhat eroded; citizens and teachers now frequently question the policies adopted by governments and education departments, and in the universities, not only the decisions of councils, committees and administrators, but the composition and authority of decision-making bodies themselves have been under fire.

The key elements in the process of conversion of inputs into outputs are the official decision-making bodies. Constitutionally, the control of education at state and federal levels lies with the parliament, and frequently major changes in education policy need the enactment of legislation. But in practice, effective control lies more with the Ministers of Education, and with the senior officials in education departments, and in official agencies such as the Australian Universities Commission. Some decisions, such as on questions of state aid, are made by Ministers and their cabinet colleagues without reference to public servants. But on most specialized policies, the real power lies with departments and agencies. The state education departments (and in N.S.W. the Department of Technical Education) are large, complex structures, with a high degree of role specialization. They exercise a tight control over the administration of all public primary, secondary and technical education. Their high degree of administrative centralization is well-known, and has been criticized frequently by visiting and Australian educators[38]. From their head offices in the state capitals, these departments control budgeting, staff recruitment and promotion, planning and research, curricula, and the supply and equipment and erection of new buildings. Critics assert that this high degree of centralization has led to mediocrity in standards, to over-conformity and the stifling of experimentation, and the failure to treat teachers as professional people. The Commonwealth Department of Education and Science is probably less highly centralized; certainly considerable power is exercised by advisory committees and boards that have been appointed with responsibilities for particular policy-areas. And even in the states, some degree of authoritative decision-making goes on at all levels

---

[38] For example, I.L. Kandel, Types of Administration, Australian Council for Educational Research, Melbourne, 1938; R. Freeman Butts, Assumptions Underlying Australian Education, Australian Council for Educational Research, Melbourne, reprinted 1965; and Walker, 'The Governance of Education in Australia'.

down to the individual school. In addition, it should be mentioned that in a number of states considerable decision-making power on education matters lies with public service boards.

On the details of the conversion or decision-making processes within the education bureaucracies we know comparatively little. This is largely because of the secrecy, both legal and cultural, that surrounds their working, and because, until recently, the lack of serious interest by students of politics or education.

The outputs from the sub-system are the binding decisions - legislation and regulations, orders and commands made within the bureaucracies, and on rare occasions judicial decisions. The main decisions concern the allocation of public resources to education and within the education sector, the imposition of fees and charges for education services, the modification of the existing pattern of official structures (i.e. departments, agencies and schools), and the variation in specific programmes and the development of new educational programmes. Many of the crucial decisions are about finance. The following table indicates the nature of some important decisions made by state governments about the level of expenditure on education in the years 1960, 1966 and 1968. Outputs or decisions

Expenditure on Education as a Percentage of of Consolidated Revenue Funds[39]

	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	S.A.	W.A.	Tas.
1960	19	21	14	16	15	20
1966	23	27	17	20	19	21
1968	23	29	19	21	19	22

lead to consequences, or what Easton calls 'outcomes'[40]. One approach in viewing outcomes in education is to assess the social and economic benefits they confer on individuals and groups, and their overall effects on equality of opportunity. Encel and others have recently exposed serious existing inequalities in educational opportunity, even within the state education systems[41].

---

[39] Fitzgerald and Segall, p.3.

[40] Easton, A Systems Analysis, p. 351.

[41] S. Encel, 'Education and Society' in Davies and Encel, pp. 418 - 424.

The education sub-system also performs its own internal communication functions, communicating information to its various parts and between it and the political system. It also performs functions to maintain itself, particularly the functions of political socialization and the recruitment to political roles. These two system maintenance functions will be discussed further in the next section.

Sub-system and System Interaction

Sub-systems are open systems. They interact with other sub-systems, with the political system at large, and with the environment. We are concerned with this interaction, but we will limit our discussion to the impact that the education sub-system has on the political system, and political system on it.

The education sub-system influences the political system in a number of different ways. Perhaps most important of all is the contribution it makes as agent of political socialization. Political socialization or politicization refers to the 'process of induction into the political culture'[42], whereby individuals, particularly children and young people, acquire attitudes and feelings about the political system, and the kinds of political roles expected of them. This learning can be thought of as being cognitive (for example, basic knowledge about the system), affective (for example, positive or negative attitudes to authorities or symbols), evaluative (for example, the judgments based on the application of certain standards to the performance of political roles) or motivative (for example, inculcation of a sense of duty to participate)[43]. Education institutions are not the sole agents involved in the process; indeed, no one knows, in fact, whether in Australia they or more or less important than other agents, particularly the family or peer-group[44]. But the fact

---

[42] Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (eds.), The Politics of Developing Areas, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1960, p. 27.

[43] On the categorization of political learning see Byron G. Massialas, Education and the Political System, Addison-Wesley, Reading (Mass.), 1969, pp. 18 -79, and 'Political Socialization in International Perspective, Educational Leadership, November 1969, p. 155; and Harmon Zeigler, The Political World of American Teachers, 1967, pp. 2 - 3.

[44] Recent overseas studies have produced conflicting conclusions on the relative importance of formal education in the process of political socialization. For example, Hess and Torney,on the basis of their large survey, state unequivocably that the'public school is the most important and effective instrument of political socialization in the United States'; other studies, however, suggest that the real impact of the school is much less than commonly assumed.

that schools have access to the minds of children for at least ten years in the period of their critical development leads us to assume that their impact is important. Moreover, it is clear that Australian schools, both government and private, deliberately seek to indoctrinate children with the basic values of society, and to instil acceptance of the political symbols of the nation, and affection towards the authorities and the regime. Schools and school systems unquestionably believe this is part of their proper role. The introduction to the N.S.W. primary school curriculum explains to teachers that children must be viewed as the 'future citizens of our democracy', and that teachers should seek to foster, among other things, 'An understanding and appreciation of the duties of responsible citizenship' and 'Respect for law, order, and social institutions; love of country and loyalty to the throne'[45]. Political information, attitudes and beliefs are conveyed to children at school assemblies, at observances of national days, and in social studies or social science lessons (though in Australia, by United States standards, the emphasis on formal teaching about politics has not been strong[46]). But children are also influenced politically by the degree of regimentation (school uniforms?) and authoritarianism in school administration, by the teaching methods and the devices employed by teachers to maintain discipline, by the political outlooks of individual teachers and how they perceive their roles as teachers[47], and by peer-groups. And while we have no detailed information on the impact of the Australian school on political learning at different stages in a child's development, it is clear that the influence of the school is directed toward maintenance of the existing order.

Of the other influences of the education sub-system, the most important briefly are as follows. First, educational institutions help develop, formulate and popularize basic social and political ideologies.

---

[45] Department of Education, New South Wales: Curriculum for Primary Schools, Government Printer, Sydney, 1960, pp. vii - x.

[46] See D.M. Bennett, 'The Study of Society in Australian Secondary Schools', Quarterly Review of Australian Education, Vol. 2, No. 1 (September 1968); P.H. Partridge, W.F. Connell, and S.W. Cohen, Social Science for the Secondary School, Ian Novak, Sydney, 1969; David G. Dufty, 'Political Education in Schools', paper read at

that schools have access to the minds of children for at least ten years in the period of their critical development leads us to assume that their impact is important. Moreover, it is clear that Australian schools, both government and private, deliberately seek to indoctrinate children with the basic values of society, and to instil acceptance of the political symbols of the nation, and affection towards the authorities and the regime. Schools and school systems unquestionably believe this is part of their proper role. The introduction to the N.S.W. primary school curriculum explains to teachers that children must be viewed as the 'future citizens of our democracy', and that teachers should seek to foster, among other things, 'An understanding and appreciation of the duties of responsible citizenship' and 'Respect for law, order, and social institutions; love of country and loyalty to the throne'[45]. Political information, attitudes and beliefs are conveyed to children at school assemblies, at observances of national days, and in social studies or social science lessons (though in Australia, by United States standards, the emphasis on formal teaching about politics has not been strong[46]). But children are also influenced politically by the degree of regimentation (school uniforms?) and authoritarianism in school administration, by the teaching methods and the devices employed by teachers to maintain discipline, by the political outlooks of individual teachers and how they perceive their roles as teachers[47], and by peer-groups. And while we have no detailed information on the impact of the Australian school on political learning at different stages in a child's development, it is clear that the influence of the school is directed toward maintenance of the existing order.

Of the other influences of the education sub-system, the most important briefly are as follows. First, educational institutions help develop, formulate and popularize basic social and political ideologies.

---

[45] Department of Education, New South Wales: Curriculum for Primary Schools, Government Printer, Sydney, 1960, pp. vii - x.

[46] See D.M. Bennett, 'The Study of Society in Australian Secondary Schools', Quarterly Review of Australian Education, Vol. 2, No. 1 (September 1968); P.H. Partridge, W.F. Connell, and S.W. Cohen, Social Science for the Secondary School, Ian Novak, Sydney, 1969; David G. Dufty, 'Political Education in Schools', paper read at annual conference of the Australian Association for Adult Education, Canberra, 1969; and Dufty, Teaching about Society.

[47] With regard to government schools, Partridge (Society, Schools and Progress, p. 63) complains of an 'officially induced caution and timidity in the treatment in the classroom of all things which are matters of strong controversy within the community'.

Many of the newer political ideas, now fairly common in the community, have been frequently promoted by university people and school teachers. It is no accident that a well-known leftist journal produced in Sydney is almost entirely the work of academics and teachers. Second, formal education has contributed to political integration. The highly centralized, state education systems have helped develop a sense of national identity; they have also helped bridge geographic distance and break down regionalism, and assimilate the children of migrants into the community. Universal compulsory education has contributed to vertical integration, helping to reduce the 'elite-mass gap'. On the other hand, the continued existence of private and church schools tends to accentuate established divisions in society. Third, formal education has a major influence on the political recruitment process. Education generally increases the life chances of an individual moving to higher occupational and income levels, and so acquiring political elite status. Furthermore, without special kinds of education or having attended particular institutions, individuals generally have little chance of competing for certain key positions in the public service or government. For instance, a university degree improves a person's chances of appointment to a senior position in the Commonwealth Public Service[48], while ex-students/of exclusive private secondary schools have an appreciably better chance of becoming a non-Labor cabinet minister or member of the diplomatic service[49]. Fourth, universal compulsory education has been responsible for the achievement of mass literacy, which enables the effective operation of the systems of political communication. Fifth, groups of people brought together because of the education industry, such as teachers and students, often perform input roles in the wider political system. Student groups, for example, appear to have had some impact on government thinking about Vietnam and national service, or at least on public thinking. Sixth, the implementation of education policy has various political consequences. Among other things, it affects the types and levels of employment, social mobility, and the

Many of the newer political ideas, now fairly common in the community, have been frequently promoted by university people and school teachers. It is no accident that a well-known leftist journal produced in Sydney is almost entirely the work of academics and teachers. Second, formal education has contributed to political integration. The highly centralized, state education systems have helped develop a sense of national identity; they have also helped bridge geographic distance and break down regionalism, and assimilate the children of migrants into the community. Universal compulsory education has contributed to vertical integration, helping to reduce the 'elite-mass gap'. On the other hand, the continued existence of private and church schools tends to accentuate established divisions in society. Third, formal education has a major influence on the political recruitment process. Education generally increases the life chances of an individual moving to higher occupational and income levels, and so acquiring political elite status. Furthermore, without special kinds of education or having attended particular institutions, individuals generally have little chance of competing for certain key positions in the public service or government. For instance, a university degree improves a person's chances of appointment to a senior position in the Commonwealth Public Service[48], while ex-students of exclusive private secondary schools have an appreciably better chance of becoming a non-Labor cabinet minister or member of the diplomatic service[49]. Fourth, universal compulsory education has been responsible for the achievement of mass literacy, which enables the effective operation of the systems of political communication. Fifth, groups of people brought together because of the education industry, such as teachers and students, often perform input roles in the wider political system. Student groups, for example, appear to have had some impact on government thinking about Vietnam and national service, or at least on public thinking. Sixth, the implementation of education policy has various political consequences. Among other things, it affects the types and levels of employment, social mobility, and the distribution of political and economic power. The implementation of policy also helps generate a whole range of new demands.

---

[48] S. Encel (Equality and Authority: A Study of Class, Statics and Power in Australia, Cheshire, Melbourne, 1970, p. 251, reports that in 1962, out of 798 senior Commonwealth public servants, 535 were graduates.

[49] Encel (Equality and Authority pp. 279 - 80) states that, of 201 entrants into the diplomatic service in the period 1942 to 1962, fifty came from private schools, and of these twenty-two were from Geelong Grammar School.

We now turn to the influences that the political system has on the education sub-system. The way in which public education is governed and administered in Australia has been obviously influenced by the general structure of the political system and its bureaucracies, and by the system's operating norms. As an area of government responsibility, education has been forced to conform to general patterns. The result is that today it is financed and controlled in a similar fashion to other fields of state and Commonwealth responsibility such as agriculture, health or social services. Education departments are broadly similar in structure and organisation to other government departments, and generally they come under the same public service regulations and the same scrutiny of public service boards. Educators sometimes forget that a high degree of centralized control, and a strong emphasis on established procedures and on achievement of efficiency[50] above all else are common characteristics of public bureaucracies in this country. Then too, structural weaknesses in the political system sometimes have a crucial effect on education. One such example is federalism. 'One of the main reasons for the neglect of education in Australia', one prominent economist writes,

> has undoubtedly been the federal system of government, whereby the states have the constitutional responsibility for education while apparently lacking the financial resources to discharge that responsibility.[50]

Then too, a government's policy on education may reflect its view of society and its political creed. It has been argued sometimes that Labor governments have shown more genuine concern about education, and have done more than their opponents to remove inequalities in educational opportunities. But it is hard to generalize about this and, furthermore, the differences between the major parties on education policy are not substantial. From time to time governments make major policy decisions on purely political grounds. For example, the present N.S.W. Government recently has established new teachers' colleges in two country centres, mainly because of promises it made during the 1965 general elections when the Liberal Party and Country Party were out of office. Similarly many of the present Commonwealth Government's education policies appear

---

[50] The emphasis on efficiency in Australian education has impressed a succession of visiting educators. For example, see Kandel, Types of Administration, p. 82; and Butts, Assumptions Underlying Australian Education, p. 68.

[51] R.L. Mathews, 'Finance for Education', Economic Papers, No. 27 (June 1968), p. 1.

to have been framed primarily to attract votes. Decisions within the education sub-system frequently are influenced by financial factors. For instance, it is well known that the N.S.W. Department of Education had to postpone for almost a decade the implementation of three-year courses in teachers' colleges, simply because the Treasury could not make funds available. And major increases in expenditure in other policy-areas of government, inevitably tends to reduce the chances of significantly increased expenditure on education.

cOo